

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 SHEET METAL WORKERS PENSION
8 TRUST OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, et
al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 PRIME MECHANICAL SERVICE, INC.,
12 Defendant.

Case No. 23-cv-06213-LJC

**ORDER RE: PROPOSED JUDGMENT
PURSUANT TO STIPULATION**

Re: ECF No. 8

13 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs Sheet Metal Workers Pension Trust of Northern
14 California, et al.’s proposed Judgment Pursuant to Stipulation. ECF No. 8. Plaintiffs request that
15 the Court enter judgment against “Defendants” and in Plaintiffs’ favor in the total amount of
16 \$170,730.87, pursuant to the terms of the parties’ stipulation. See id. However, Plaintiffs have
17 not filed proof of service indicating that Defendant Prime Mechanical Service, Inc. was properly
18 served with summons and a copy of the Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.
19 Nor has counsel for Defendant entered an appearance in this case. Under Rule 4(l) of the Federal
20 Rules of Civil Procedure, unless service is waived, proof of service must be made to the Court. If
21 Defendant has not been properly served, Plaintiffs are directed to complete service as
22 contemplated by Rule 4, and file proof of service soon thereafter, or file proof that service of
23 summons has been waived.

24 The Court also noted that Plaintiffs request that the Court enter judgment against John M.
25 Eshelman, who is not a party named in their Complaint. See ECF No. 1. Mr. Eshelman’s
26 signature for himself, individually, is not dated, and it appears to be a generic electronic signature.
27 Similarly, Mr. Eshelman’s signature as RMO/CEO/President of Prime Mechanical Service, Inc. is
28 also undated and appears to be a generic electronic signature. Local Rule 5-1(i)(3) requires,

1 among other things, “[i]n the case of a signatory who is not an ECF user, or who is an ECF user
2 but whose user ID and password are not utilized in the electronic filing of the document (as in the
3 case of documents requiring multiple signatures), the filer of the document shall attest that each of
4 the other Signatories have concurred in the filing of the document, which shall serve in lieu of
5 their signatures on the document.” The proposed Judgment Pursuant to Stipulation does not
6 comply with Rule 5-1(i)(3).

7 Finally, Plaintiffs do not indicate in the proposed Judgment Pursuant to Stipulation
8 whether they intend to amend their complaint to add Mr. Eshelman as a defendant before
9 judgment is entered against him. No later than four days from the date of this Order, Plaintiffs
10 must file a letter of no more than three pages explaining how the Court can enter judgment against
11 Mr. Eshelman without an Amended Complaint, or alternatively, file an amended complaint which
12 joins Mr. Eshelman as a party to this action. If Mr. Eshelman is joined as a party, he must also be
13 served with summons and a copy of the complaint naming him as a defendant pursuant to Rule 4,
14 unless service is waived.

15 Finally, it is well settled that “no action of the parties can confer subject-matter
16 jurisdiction upon a federal court” and “the consent of the parties is irrelevant.” Insurance Corp. of
17 Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee, 456 U.S. 694, 702 (1982). On the other hand,
18 under Kokken v. Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America, 511 U.S. 375, 381–82 (1994), a district
19 court may enforce a settlement agreement if the court retains jurisdiction to enforce the settlement
20 agreement. Kokken states that when the dismissal is pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(ii), “the court is
21 authorized to embody the settlement contract in its dismissal order or, what has the same effect,
22 retain jurisdiction over the settlement contract if the parties agree.” Id.

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Line 25 of the proposed Judgment Pursuant to Stipulation appears to be insufficient to
2 extend this Court's jurisdiction, as it references the parties' agreement to extend jurisdiction until
3 the judgment is satisfied, but it does not reference the parties' agreement to extend the Court's
4 jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the parties' settlement agreement which, implicitly, appears to
5 be the basis for the proposed Judgment Pursuant to Stipulation.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: December 4, 2023

8
9
10 
11 LISA J. CISNEROS
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28